



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,059	09/30/2003	Brent Dalmas Nelson	EDSC105US0	5833
34279	7590	08/17/2007		
DOCKET CLERK, DM/EDS P.O. DRAWER 800889 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER DAO, THUY CHAN	
			ART UNIT 2192	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/17/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/675,059

Applicant(s)

NELSON, BRENT DALMAS

Examiner

Thuy Dao

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05/25/07.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on May 25, 2007.
2. Claims 1-20 have been examined.

Response to Amendments

3. Per Applicant's request, claims 5, 10, 14 have been amended.
4. The objection to claims 5, 10, and 14 is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments.

Response to Arguments

5. The Applicant is thanked for a thorough reply. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection is made as set forth in details in paragraphs 10 and 11 below.

Specification

6. The specification is objected to because of minor informalities: page 3, lines 2-4, the sentence "*Wherever ... to maintain and extend the .*" is incomplete.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

7. Claims are objected to because of minor informalities:

Claim 1: line 13, the number "20" appears to be a typo;

Claim 10: line 10, the number "10" appears to be a typo;

Claim 16: line 3, the number "5" appears to be a typo;

Claim 18: line 3, the phrase is considered to read as - "...relative to said associated model.- - as previously recited in line 1; and

Claim 19 (original): lines 11-14 have been accidentally merged and should be separate again as originally filed.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8:

Claim 8 recites the limitations "*relationship type names*", "*relationship type connection rules*", and "*relationship type derivation rules*" (emphasis added) while the originally filed specification only discloses "*relationship types*", "*relationship rules*", and "*standardized relationship derivation rules*" (e.g., pp. 22-23, [0055-0056]; pp. 27-28, [0069] and [0071]) and as recited in claims 17 and 20.

To be supported by the specification and maintain consistency in claims 8, 17, and 20, appropriate correction to said limitations in claim 8 is required.

For the purpose of compact prosecution, the examiner treats the limitations in claim 8 as recited in claims 17 and 20.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent Publication No. 2002/0002625 A1 to Vange et al. (art made of record, hereinafter "Vange").

Claim 1:

Vange discloses a system, a storage medium, and a *method for converting a first metamodel system that is standards-noncompliant into a second metamodel system that is standards-compliant* (e.g., FIG. 1, [0038-0042]), comprising the steps of:

substituting automatically a plurality of standards noncompliant hyperlinks within said first metamodel system with a plurality of standards-compliant hyperlinks (e.g., [0008], [0024-0025], [0063], FIG. 2B, [0047-0051]);

substituting automatically a plurality of standards-noncompliant entity names associated with entities of said first metamodel system with standards-compliant entity names (e.g., [0007-0010], [0031-0037], FIG. 3, [0054-0063]);

substituting automatically a plurality of standards noncompliant file names for associated files within said first metamodel system with a plurality of standards compliant file names for said associated files (e.g., [0009-0011], [0039], [0057], FIG. 4, [0064-0076]);

organizing said entities having standards-compliant entity names into a plurality of files and folders having standards-compliant file names (e.g., [0039], [0044-0045], [0069]);

converting object identity values associated with objects within said first metamodel system into a single predetermined object identity value (e.g., [0045], [0069], source objects converted to target objects with single object identity value of 1 as unique target components stored in cache);

substituting standards-noncompliant relationship types within said first metamodel system with standards compliant relationships types (e.g., [0031], [0072], [0010-0012], source web pages embed images and audio files changes to target web pages do not embed images and audio files); and

substituting remaining standards-compliant mark-up language within said first metamodel system with standards compliant mark-up language to yield said second metamodel system (e.g., [0007-0009], [0035], [0087]).

Claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Vange also *parsing automatically said files within said first metamodal system for said standards-noncompliant entity names* (e.g., [0007-0011], [0037-0039], [0057]).

Claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Vange also discloses *of associating said standards non-compliant entity names with said standards-compliant entity names in an index* (e.g., [0007-0010], [0031-0037]).

Claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Vange also *associating said standards non-compliant file names with said standards-compliant file names in an index* (e.g., [0039], [0044-0045]).

Claim 5:

The rejection of claim 4 is incorporated. Vange also *associating said standards non-compliant entity names with said standards-compliant entity names in an index* (e.g., [0007-0010], [0031-0037]).

Claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Vange also discloses *said standards-compliant hyperlinks substituting step further comprises the step of substituting automatically a plurality of standards-noncompliant hyperlinks within said first metamodel System with a plurality of standards-compliant hyperlinks using an index* (e.g., [0008], [0024-0025]).

Claim 7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Vange also discloses *setting object identity values associated with objects within said first metamodel system into a single predetermined object identity value of 1* (e.g., [0045], [0069]).

Claim 8:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Vange also *deriving said standards-compliant relationship types using relationship rules associated with a predetermined set of standardized relationship derivation rules* (e.g., [0031], [00723]).

Claim 9:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Vange also *verifying the operability of said second metamodel system with an associated model by testing the operation of said standards-compliant hyperlinks in said second metamodel system with said associated model* (e.g., FIG. 1, [0038-0042]; FIG. 3, [0054-0063]; FIG. 4A, [0064-0076]).

Claims 10-18:

Claims 10-18 are system versions, which recite the same limitations as those of claims 1-9, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the reference teaches all of the limitations of the above claims, it also teaches all of the limitations of claims 10-18.

Claims 19-20:

Claims 19-20 are storage medium versions, which recite the same limitations as those of claims 1 and 8, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the reference teaches all of the limitations of the above claims, it also teaches all of the limitations of claims 19-20.

11. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "Vignette Engineering – Integration of Vignette V6 Content Suite and IBM Web Sphere Commerce Suite 5.1", April 2002 (art made of record, hereinafter "Vignette V6").

Claim 1:

Vignette V6 discloses a system, a storage medium, and a *method for converting a first metamodel system that is standards-noncompliant into a second metamodel system that is standards-compliant* (e.g., page 3, Figure 2, Integration Control Flow; noncompliant metamodel in WebSphere Application Server; compliant metamodel in Vignette V6 Customer-facing Web Server), *comprising the steps of:*

substituting automatically a plurality of standards noncompliant hyperlinks within said first metamodel system with a plurality of standards-compliant hyperlinks (e.g., page 6, Figure 6, "In Fashion" home page with links substituted by "Company XYZ" home page with associated links in page 7, Figure 8);

substituting automatically a plurality of standards-noncompliant entity names associated with entities of said first metamodel system with standards-compliant entity names (e.g., pp. 6-8, images, text, formats, icons);

substituting automatically a plurality of standards noncompliant file names for associated files within said first metamodel system with a plurality of standards compliant file names for said associated files (e.g., pp. 6-8, JSP templates, "header.jsp", "sidebar.jsp", and "footer.jsp");

organizing said entities having standards-compliant entity names into a plurality of files and folders having standards-compliant file names (e.g., page 4, files and folders, Administrative Console in WebSphere; page 5, files and folders, Content Manager in Vignette V6);

converting object identity values associated with objects within said first metamodel system into a single predetermined object identity value (e.g., page 10, Figure 10, Vignette V6 Keyword Manager, which sets object identity values of "men_s" "women_s" to predetermined value 1 as unique/separate objects);

substituting standards-noncompliant relationship types within said first metamodel system with standards compliant relationships types (e.g., pp. 5-6, source page "In Fashion" is not personalized; pp. 6-7, target page "Company XYZ" is personalized); *and*

substituting remaining standards-compliant mark-up language within said first metamodel system with standards compliant mark-up language to yield said second

metamodel system (e.g., page 11, 13-14, transforming/integrating all source pages and templates to target pages; page 3, Figure 2 and related text).

Claim 10:

Claim 10 is a system version, which recites the same limitations as those of claim 1, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the reference teaches all of the limitations of the above claim, it also teaches all of the limitations of claim 10.

Claim 19:

Claim 19 is a storage medium version, which recites the same limitations as those of claim 1, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the reference teaches all of the limitations of the above claim, it also teaches all of the limitations of claim 19.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Thuy Dao (Twee), whose telephone is (571) 272 8570. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 6:00AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached at (571) 272 3695.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2192

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

T. Dao

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tuan Dam', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the left.

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER